

# **CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY**

## **Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science**

### **Minutes of Meeting 94-4 of the**

### **Engineering and Computer Science Faculty Council**

#### **held**

**Friday, April 8, 1994**

**Present:** Professors D.J. Taddeo (Chair); V.S. Alagar; P. Fazio; C. Goldman; K. Ha; F.D. Hamblin; W.M. Jaworski; K. Khorasani; T. Krepec; A. Krzyzak; V.N. Latinovic; C. Marsh; J. Opatrny; O.A. Pekau; R. Shinghal; T. Stathopoulos; C.Y. Suen; K. Thulasiraman; G.D. Xistris; Prof. G.H. Vatistas (Graduate Studies); Lee Harris (Library); T.L. Swift (Registrar's Office); R. Vallurupalli (Grad. Rep.); G. Turski (Secretary).

**Regrets:** Prof. R.B. Bhat

**Visitors:** Prof. F. Bird (Religion); L. Zack (Public Relations)

**1. Adoption of Agenda**

**Motion 94-4-1** The agenda was unanimously adopted. (G. Vatistas, T. Stathopoulos)

**2. Adoption of Minutes**

**Motion 94-4-2** The Minutes of Meeting 94-3 (March 18, 1994) were unanimously approved. (V.N. Latinovic, C.Y. Suen)

**3. Chair's Remarks**

The Chair announced that Item #4 (Proposed University Code of Ethics) will be addressed at 2:45 p.m. upon the arrival of Dr. F. Bird, Chair of the Code of Ethics Task Force.

The Chair informed that the Office of the Dean has received from the Visiting Team of the Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board the accreditation report. Each Department has been forwarded the relevant section of the document and is currently preparing a response to it. The Faculty response to the report should be finalized and

forwarded to the CEAB by the end of April, 1994. The Dean's appearance before the Board is scheduled for June 7.

On Chair's invitation, Prof. Hamblin announced that the deadline for submitting applications for the OIQ Prix d'Excellence awards to outstanding graduating students in engineering has been extended to April 15. Prof. Hamblin urged all Chairs to solicit applications from appropriate candidates and informed them that a reminder will be forthcoming by way of a memo. At least one application from each engineering department would be desirable.

5. Religious Holy Days--Response from ECUSC (ECFC Doc. 94-4-4)

Prof. Hamblin reported that the Engineering and Computer Science Undergraduate Studies Committee met and considered ECFC Doc. 94-3-1. The committee then drafted a proposal statement on behalf of the Faculty (see ECFC Doc. 94-4-4), which statement, if approved, would then be forwarded to the Academic Programmes Committee.

Motion  
94-4-3

That the proposed statement in ECFC Doc. 94-4-4 be approved by Council and forwarded to the APC as the Faculty's response in the matter of Religious Holy Days. (D. Hamblin, K. Ha)

Prof. Goldman suggested that in line with his original suggestion at the last Council meeting, "non-sectarian" should be replaced by "secular" in the statement's opening sentence. Prof. Hamblin agreed with this suggestion.

Vote: Carried unanimously

6. Undergraduate Curriculum Changes (ECFC Doc. 94-4-5)

Prof. Stathopoulos apologized for the fact that Doc. 94-4-5, as originally distributed, was, due to a photocopying error, incomplete. A complete version was provided to all Council members prior to the meeting. Prof. Stathopoulos explained that the document incorporated all of the changes recommended by the Undergraduate Studies Committee as a result of a process of consultation with all departments of the Faculty. At this stage, prior to the upcoming unit appraisals, the curriculum changes are not extensive.

Prof. Stathopoulos summarized the changes (as well as their rationales) proposed by the Departments of Electrical and Computer Engineering and Mechanical Engineering, and outlined in Doc. 94-4-5. He emphasized that none of the proposed changes have any significant resource implications.

Motion  
94-4-4

That the Faculty Council approve the curriculum changes outlined in Doc. 94-4-5 and forward them for adoption to the University Senate (T. Stathopoulos, K. Ha-Huy)

Vote: Carried unanimously

7.

Graduate Slot Courses (ECFC Doc. 94-4-6)

Prof. Stathopoulos noted that there is one request for a graduate slot course--ELEC 6xx--to be offered during the upcoming summer session. He further informed Council that the Graduate Studies Committee has met and considered this request, and is recommending that Council approve it.

Motion  
94-4-5

That the Faculty Council approve ELEC 6xx as a slot course to be offered during the summer session of 1994. (T. Stathopoulos, K. Thulasiraman)

Prof. Goldman inquired about the number of students expected to be taking the above-mentioned course, and Prof. Stathopoulos informed him that approximately ten students are foreseen to be attending it.

Vote: Carried unanimously

8.

Advisory Search Committees (ECFC Docs. 94-4-1, -2, -3)

Prof. Hamblin noted that there is some urgency to providing input to the Secretary General's Office regarding profiles of the Rector, the Dean of Commerce and Administration, and the Dean of Engineering and Computer Science, since Me Gaudet had asked that this input be forwarded from the Faculty by April 29, 1994.

Prof. Goldman remarked that while input on the profiles of senior administrators is being currently solicited, the profiles themselves appear to have been already approved by the Board of Governors. The Dean responded that whatever has been approved to date in the matter of profiles, the process remains open toward integrating further input.

With regard to the profile of the Rector and Vice-Chancellor, Prof. Goldman proposed adding the following stipulations: 1) that the Rector and Vice-Chancellor should attend at least two regular meetings with faculty per year for the purpose of exchanging information with the senior administration; 2) that, at least once per academic year, the Rector and Vice-Chancellor address the faculty and students in a "state of the University" message; and 3) that the Rector and Vice-Chancellor teach one course per semester in order to be familiar with the teaching issues confronting students and faculty. Prof. Goldman further suggested that the provision about

teaching should also be included in the description of the profile of the Dean of Commerce and Administration.

According to Prof. Goldman, the description of the position of Dean of Engineering and Computer Science should include the following: 1) that the Dean teach one undergraduate course per semester; 2) that as a leader of a professional Faculty, the Dean should have experience in the profession and make a commitment to advancing the profession through activities designed to gain respect from professional engineers and professional bodies; 3) that the Dean should designate one Associate Dean to be responsible for professional development and especially for relations with outside bodies; 4) that the Dean attend at least two meetings per year with each department in the Faculty, which meetings should include students and staff; and 5) that the Dean should make it a priority to encourage more women to enter the engineering profession, as well as to integrate the Faculty's ethnic students.

Prof. Stathopoulos clarified that, to date, no profiles of senior administrators have been approved by the Board of Governors, and that the profiles currently circulated and under discussion throughout the University are those used the last time each position under consideration was searched.

Prof. Fazio remarked that the profiles should be more realistic than the current highly idealistic ones. This would enable the various search committees to better adhere to the criteria used in the selection of suitable candidates.

Noting the importance of the profile issue, the Chair suggested that the Faculty take more time to develop its input, and that, after consultation within departments, the matter should again be discussed at the next Faculty Council meeting on May 20.

Because the Faculty comprises both engineers and computer scientists, Prof. Hamblin advocated a certain openness in the drafting of the profile of the Dean of Engineering and Computer Science. Insisting that the next Dean must be a professional engineer is just too restrictive. Prof. Krepec noted that the most desirable situation would be one in which the Dean was both a computer scientist as well as a professional engineer.

For his part, Dean Taddeo mentioned that while professional registration would be important for the next Dean, it cannot serve as an overriding criterion; a university is an academic body and thus has different priorities than professional engineering associations. The Dean also advocated highlighting in the profile the individual's ability to establish links with industry as well as his or her knowledge of the Quebec context.

Motion  
94-4-5

That the Council of the Faculty of Engineering solicit input from all departments of the Faculty concerning the profiles of senior administrators for the purpose of discussing this issue further at the Council meeting of May 20. (G. Vatisstas, T. Stathopoulos)

Vote: Carried (1 abstention)

4.

Proposed University Code of Ethics (ECFC Doc. 94-2-2)

The Chair welcomed Dr. F. Bird, Chair of the Task Force on the proposed University Code of Ethics, and asked Prof. Suen to give a brief overview of the developments concerning the Faculty's input to the Code. Prof. Suen explained that Dr. Bird had been forwarded the relevant sections of the Minutes of the last Council meeting, wherein the document was extensively discussed, and was further invited to the current meeting in order to engage in a direct exchange with members of the Council.

Dr. Bird apprised Council of the mandate and status of his Task Force. He noted that his committee felt it necessary to obtain public reaction to the original draft Code written by the University's legal counsel. A revised version of the document should be ready some time in the month of May, so that it, in turn, can be vetted before the onset of summer. Dr. Bird acknowledged receipt of input already forwarded to him by the Faculty and mentioned that some of it was already incorporated into the Code document. He explained that the intent behind the document is to be neither excessively technical and legalistic nor, on the other hand, to be so general and vague as to have little binding force. The Task Force is also concerned about making the document as comprehensive as possible, so that it addresses the behaviour not just of faculty, but of others within the University community.

Dr. Bird further outlined the structure of the document. Sections dealing with academic integrity have been moved to the forefront, followed by those on integrity in research, conflicts of interest, disclosure, and the raising of questions and complaints and dealing with problems.

Prof. Goldman inquired as to who would receive and adjudicate complaints and, more specifically, whether an independent Ethics Committee would be established for this purpose. Dr. Bird answered that at the present time there is no such committee, but admitted that there eventually may be a need for it. Currently the issue is unresolved. Prof. Goldman further expressed concern about the length of the Concordia document. The ethical guidelines produced by other universities or professional bodies are typically much shorter.

Agreeing with Prof. Goldman, Prof. Krepec also advocated a shorter document, one practical benefit of which would be that at least it would stand a chance of being read. Prof. Krepec stated that the document should explicate fully only issues germane to the academic setting, since everyone is (presumably) already guided by other more general normative frameworks that prevail in society.

Prof. Suen asked Dr. Bird about the percentage of universities that already have academic ethics codes, and also about how these analogous documents differ from the

one to be potentially proposed at Concordia. Dr. Bird replied that currently most universities have documents on academic ethics, although not all of these documents are sufficiently comprehensive and integrative of all aspects of academic life. To reflect the latter features in the Concordia document remains a principal objective of the Task Force. Dr. Bird noted that virtually all academic codes outline procedures for dealing with misconduct by faculty, and that addressing research issues (e.g., plagiarism, falsification, proper handling of research funds) through such codes has become a necessity, since this is about to become a condition of obtaining funds from granting agencies.

Prof. Opatrny remarked that the main difficulty with the draft Code lies in its leaving too many situations to an excessively broad interpretations, and that this, in turn, could make faculty members liable to have legal action taken against them. Dr. Opatrny provided several examples from the document which potentially could have this effect.

In response to Dean Taddeo's inquiry, Dr. Bird informed Council that a finalized version of the proposed Code will be submitted to the Faculty for consideration. Dr. Suen announced that a Task Force comprising himself and Profs. Goldman, Hayes, and Ha-Huy has been established to provide further consultative input on behalf of the Faculty to Dr. Bird's committee. A meeting of the two groups prior to the publication of the final version of the proposed Code document was agreed upon.

The Chair thanked Dr. Bird for the important work he is doing for the University, and for taking the time to attend the meeting of the Faculty Council.

9. Faculty Elections--Presentation on the Single Transferable Vote (ECFC Doc. 94-4-7)

The Chair asked Council members to reconvene in H-435 for the purpose of attending Prof. Hamblin's presentation on the Single Transferable Vote. A number of questions pertaining to this voting procedure were raised and discussed during this presentation.

10. Other Business

None

11. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:10 p.m.